Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
8/22/74
301/473-8186

Dear Ron,

The book is completely assembled for the printer except for the cover, which I'm now doing, and the index, on which my wife is making the last few insertions from the last pages of the appendix.

Today's Post confirms the fears I expressed a week ago. And as I then said, I can see Ford vetoing if there is no major withdrawal on the amendments, unless it is made too great a political liability for him.

Jim had to stay in Memphis after yesterday's successful hearing. He may not return until tomorrow night. I did speak to Bud after reading this story. His belief is that nothing more will happen until after the recess. I hope this is the case.

The story leaves me uncertain about what may be significant details. My impression is that a major effort is being made to gut if not reduce. My experience tells me that the language of the law can be made to mean little by a determined and unscrupulous government.

If there is to be an effort to restore the amendments to their original meaning, all the experience of my life tells me that not consumer issues but political issues and tough fact with political overtones alone can do it and reduce the chances of a veto. Here the suit that leads to this book presents a remarkable record and one that I think should be used. There is much more than I could get in the book. The last addition to the appendix, which addresses the judicial review and the representations about secrecy, had to be too condensed. However, we do have extensive correspondence on this. I gave Jim copies of part to give you but the pressures of preparing for yesterday's hearing, with everything else, may have prevented it. I'll enclose a full copy of Rhoads' last letter, which I'd hoped to be able to reproduce in full and have waxed together. There was no space.

I'm sorry you have not been able to go over either this book or my files. The invitation, of course, still stands. On both "national security" and "investigatory files" I doubt you'll find a better horrible example. As a non-lawyer understands the words, there is fraud and there is perjury. I have long spoken to overly-busy Jim about a damage suit along the lines laid out by the Administrative Council because these same transgressions contaminate each of my four suits.

Had Jim not been so busy on the Ray case he'd have confronted Silbert, at my request, with a choice between charging Rankin or me. Then they rooted by giving me the transcript. So I charge perjury in the book instead, all I can now do.

(I think that regardless of the outcome of the conference and the vote, unless you lawyers find some way of dealing with official dishonesties we'll be defending loosers far into the future. If as I think the line into illegality has been crossed, I believe making demands based on it is necessary. With money-damages suits.)

Perhaps I am more apprehensive than the situation justifies. However, I am concerned. I have done as I said I would, arranged for the book to be printed in advance of the completion of the cover, in the event copies are needed. This will be done as soon as mechanically possible. There is but a single xerox in the area now, aside from Jim's copy, which a TV net has to consider a documentary. (Can you help there?) I have it, if you want to go over it. It may be too late for today's mail (so excuse the typos in my effort to make it). If this does not go out today, I'll be working in DC tomorrow, on the book, and will phone you.

Hastily,